

**APPROVED**  
**MINUTES**  
**NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS**  
**REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**AUGUST 24, 2016 – 3:30 P.M.**

**Cumulative Attendance**  
**May 2016 - April 2017**

<b><u>Members Present</u></b>	<b><u>Attendance</u></b>	<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
Steve Lucas, Chair	P	4	0
Jessie Adderley (arr. 3:41)	P	4	0
Nikki Austin-Shipp	A	0	1
Leann Barber	P	3	1
Sonya Burrows	P	4	0
Ron Centamore	P	4	0
Alan Gabriel	P	3	1
Mickey Hinton (arr. 3:42)	P	4	0
John Hooper	A	2	2
Dylan Lagi	P	4	0
Steffen Lue (arr. 3:42)	A	1	3
Jacqueline Reed (arr. 3:58)	P	3	1
Scott Strawbridge	P	4	0
John Wilkes	P	3	1

Currently there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

**Staff**

Jonathan Brown, Northwest CRA Manager  
Bob Wojcik, Planner II  
Sandra Doughlin, DSD/ECR  
Diana Alarcon, Director, Department of Transportation and Mobility  
Kevin Walford, Department of Transportation and Mobility  
Debbie Griner, Department of Transportation and Mobility  
Mike Maier, Chief Technology Officer, Information Technology Services Department  
Jamie Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to City Commission**

None.

**I. Call to Order / Roll Call**

Chair Lucas called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

Ms. Adderley arrived at 3:41 p.m.

Mr. Lue arrived at 3:42 p.m.

**II. Approval of Minutes from June 14, 2016 Special Meeting, and June 22, 2016 and July 27, 2016 Regular Meetings**

**Motion** made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to approve [the June 14, 2016 minutes]. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**Motion** made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Wilkes, to approve [the June 22, 2016 minutes]. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**Motion** made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Lagi, to approve [the July 27, 2016 minutes].

Ms. Burrows noted a correction to p.11 of the July 27, 2016 minutes: she asked that the minutes reflect the fact that the Board had always received a breakdown of the CRA budget in the past.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously [as amended].

**III. Funding Request – Firewalls – Jonathan Brown, NPF CRA Manager**

Mr. Brown stated that the Board has received a funding request from the City, which has sent out an RFP to select a vendor to provide additional firewall protection. The City-wide cost will be approximately \$332,000; the CRA portion of this protection will cost \$62,637. These expenses are associated with the existing cameras on Sistrunk Boulevard.

Mr. Centamore observed that no breakdown of the budget accompanied the request. Mr. Brown explained that a budget amendment would follow, and that the expense is part of the existing budget previously recommended by the Advisory Board. The City used a competitive bid process to secure the best rate for this product. The expense does not include the addition of any new cameras, although Ms. Burrows recalled that at a previous meeting, a member of the Fort Lauderdale Police Department had mentioned that eight new cameras were expected to be brought online.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that there had been no need for additional firewall protection for the existing cameras within the CRA, which suggested that the need may be specific to City information technology (IT) protocols. Mr. Brown replied that this was not expected to be an annual expense, as the cost is associated with an upgrade to the existing firewall system.

Mr. Wilkes estimated that there are 90 cameras throughout the City, which would mean the total cost of the upgrade would come to roughly \$3550 per camera. He was not certain that this was an expense the CRA needed to fund. Mr. Lagi added that the cost appeared to include equipment only but no labor expenses. It was determined that the Board members wished to hear additional information on this Item.

**Motion** made by Mr. Centamore, seconded by Mr. Strawbridge, that the Board does not support this funding. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 11-0.

#### **IV. Discussion – Transit Master Plan – Transportation & Mobility**

Diana Alarcon, Director of the Department of Transportation and Mobility, explained that the previous year, the Department applied for federal grant funding that allowed consultant Tindale-Oliver to perform a transit study for the community bus service program. This study included a review of efficiencies in the current route, ways to fund the program, and determine operational practices associated with a five-star system. Today's presentation would show some of the study's key findings, and another presentation will be made at the end of 2016 to provide the Board with its final results.

Tara Crawford of Tindale-Oliver, deputy project manager for the transit study, showed a PowerPoint presentation on its key findings to the Board. The study included community engagement and public outreach within the City, as well as preliminary route analyses and areas of emphasis. The goal of the grant funding was to enhance mobility options in Fort Lauderdale by increasing accessibility and connectivity, as well as identifying and prioritizing short- and long-term service and capital improvements.

Ms. Crawford reported that thus far, a demand needs analysis has been completed and an operational and route analysis and five-year plan are near completion. She provided an overview of the Downtown Fort Lauderdale Transit Management Association's (DFLTMA's) Sun Trolley, which operates eight bus routes, two of which extend through the Northwest CRA. The Sun Trolley served over 560,000 riders in Fort Lauderdale in 2015. The study includes these routes as well as a one-quarter mile buffer around the TMA's service area.

Ms. Reed arrived at 3:58 p.m.

Ms. Crawford continued that a traditional market analysis studied potential segments of the population that typically use transit, including the elderly, zero-vehicle households,

and individuals living below the poverty line, and determines where high concentrations of these populations reside. These areas include Commercial Boulevard, Oakland Park Boulevard, and the Northwest community, which includes the Northwest CRA. A discretionary market analysis also determined that high density where these populations live and work are necessary to support the level of service the City hopes to provide.

In 2015, Downtown Fort Lauderdale has the highest concentration of transit-supportive development, with condominiums and commercial buildings. A projected analysis shows that future growth in this area is expected to support premium transit investments such as Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) by the year 2040. Ms. Crawford noted that there is significant growth between south and northwest Downtown and SE 17<sup>th</sup> Street, which follows the alignment of the Wave Modern Streetcar.

Community outreach included in-person interviews with various agencies and community leaders, conducted between January and May 2016. One need identified for the Northwest community was more frequent trolley service. Surveys were also distributed to over 100 agencies within the community, including businesses, governmental entities, nonprofits, developers, and other community representatives. All respondents were asked to identify what they felt to be the City's transit needs, which included service to the beach, airport and seaport, and the Sistrunk Boulevard and Downtown areas.

The project team also conducted a web survey, which identified individuals who have ridden the Sun Trolley at least once as well as members of the general public. The most-needed improvement was identified as more frequent trolley service. Surveys were also delivered door-to-door in the Northwest community, where results indicated that the primary purpose for trips on the Sun Trolley was shopping for necessities.

Field workers rode each of the Sun Trolley routes and broke them up into segments to identify which areas are most commonly used. Ms. Crawford reviewed each of the Sun Trolley routes, directing the Board's attention to the Sistrunk area, which can offer more connectivity in the future. The result of the overall needs summary includes the need to improve and enhance service with connections to the airport, Port Everglades, and the Wave.

Next steps include a review of finances and a final operational and route analysis, which will consider both short- and long-term implementation plans before and after Wave service is introduced. The study will also undertake a staffing and replacement plan, a five-year financial plan, and a community bus master plan.

Mr. Gabriel asked if the upcoming penny surtax referendum in Broward County would affect the financial planning of the TMA. Ms. Alarcon clarified that the referendum will propose a half-cent surtax to fund transportation and a half-cent to fund infrastructure, the latter of which would go to individual municipalities. Cities are asked to submit ten-

year plans relating how these infrastructure funds would be spent on an annual basis. Transportation dollars will go directly to the County, which must also submit a ten-year plan.

Mr. Strawbridge requested additional information on Title VI. Ms. Crawford explained that this refers to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in programs or activities that receive federal funding. It means service must not be discontinued for areas with a disproportionate minority population, such as the Northwest community. Ms. Crawford pointed out that the results of the stakeholder survey rated the Northwest as the most important area in which to improve and enhance service.

Ms. Barber commented that she would like to see a needs analysis for residents and business owners specifically within the CRA, where she felt the greatest need for transit exists. Ms. Crawford advised that the survey was conducted for the entire City. Ms. Alarcon added that because Broward County Transit (BCT) is the lead provider of transit service in Broward County, that entity should be included in any discussion of providing transit needs within the CRA. She clarified that the Northwest area falls under the category of “other” in some portions of the survey results.

Ms. Burrows asked if more weight was given to survey results reflecting need-based use of transit as opposed to leisure-based use. Ms. Alarcon confirmed that this was the case. She concluded that the Department of Transportation and Mobility had previously provided the Board with a Sistrunk feasibility memorandum, which found that there is potential ridership on Sistrunk Boulevard moving toward NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Recent changes in the City’s zoning Code allow greater density in that area, which in turn supports the possibility of building ridership; however, this potential is limited further down Sistrunk Boulevard due to zoning in that area.

## **V. Update – Funding Request: Sun Trolley – Transportation and Mobility**

Ms. Alarcon explained that this funding request would support TMA service in the Northwest community. At the July 27, 2016 meeting, the Board had requested more information before making a decision on funding. The TMA has requested an additional \$64,903 to make up for the loss of grant funding which ended in June 2016. The TMA typically uses CRA funds last: if all funds are not used at the end of the year, they remain with the CRA. The total request for fiscal year (FY) 2016-2017 is for \$261,612, which is based upon the portion of the Northwest route that lies within the CRA.

Ms. Barber observed that she would like to first hear a needs analysis for the CRA before providing funds. Ms. Alarcon pointed out that the TMA’s highest ridership occurs on the routes that include portions of the CRA. Robyn Chiarelli, Executive Director of the TMA, added that the CRA Board is one of the organization’s resources in understanding market needs for the subject area.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that the routes within the CRA are approximately 10 years old despite recent redevelopment, including grocery stores located within the CRA that can only be reached by changing buses on the route. He characterized the request as appearing to charge the CRA for the full route, and asked where unspent CRA funds return to if they are not used. Mr. Brown confirmed that any unspent dollars are reallocated annually and used elsewhere.

Mr. Strawbridge continued that the CRA's support of the Sun Trolley has increased significantly during his tenure on the Board but there has been no appreciable modification to the CRA routes. Ms. Alarcon advised that the Northwest route underwent changes roughly four years ago in partnership with the Housing Authority, and now recognizes that more study is necessary in order to further optimize the existing routes using limited funds.

Ms. Burrows asked if it would be possible for the Board to support only those routes that serve areas experiencing slum and blight, rather than a portion of the Downtown route, which does not experience these difficulties. Ms. Alarcon noted that the Board is not asked to support portions of the Downtown, Northwest, and Neighborhood routes outside the CRA, even though portions outside the CRA connect to some of the areas the Board wishes the Sun Trolley to serve, such as the food bank and health center.

Ms. Alarcon explained that the TMA uses fare box revenue collected on other routes, as well as dollars provided through the organization's Parking Enterprise Fund, gas tax dollars, grant funds, and other eligible sources of funding to fill funding gaps on routes within the CRA. Ms. Chiarelli added that funds from private charter services and sponsorships may also be used toward this purpose.

Mr. Centamore asked how the Northwest, Neighborhood, and Beach routes would be funded after the Beach and Northwest CRAs sunset in the future. Ms. Alarcon reiterated that one purpose of the Master Plan presented earlier is to identify a sustainable financial plan for the time when current funding sources are no longer available. Ms. Chiarelli noted that the TMA seeks private funding wherever available in order to reduce reliance on grants and other governmental funding and increase funding from private sources, such as some of the stores located along its routes.

Ms. Burrows asked if CRA funding could be provided only for the Northwest and Neighborhood routes but not the Downtown route. Ms. Alarcon confirmed that this could be done. She pointed out, however, that the Master Plan reflects a significant number of boardings and connections on and from the Downtown route to other routes within the CRA.

Mr. Wilkes commented that there is clearly a need for mass transit within the CRA, but advised that the TMA's system should be integrated with other transit systems for the

best chance of success. He emphasized the need to ensure all potential transit riders are informed about the Sun Trolley's service.

**Motion** made by Mr. Wilkes to approve the request for the additional funding.

Mr. Lue asked if there is a way to use any CRA funds not spent on the existing routes to modify those routes. Ms. Alarcon replied that if an opportunity to modify these routes is identified, the TMA will come back before the Board. She explained that there is a great deal of work involved in adding services or adjusting routes, including public and stakeholder meetings.

The **motion** was duly **seconded**, with the clarification that "additional funding" refers to \$64,903 as well as the FY 2016-17 funding request.

Mr. Centamore requested clarification that this could not be construed as retroactive funding, recalling that in July, the Board voted to provide some funds retroactive to the time when an updated CRA Master Plan was adopted. Ms. Alarcon clarified out that the TMA's request includes funding that would cover the months of July, August, and September in the current fiscal year. Mr. Brown assured the Board that the request would be reviewed by the City's Legal Department to ensure that this is an eligible expense.

Ms. Reed expressed concern that the CRA Master Plan may or may not include the changes planned for the Northwest area. Ms. Alarcon reiterated that any funding changes must be brought back before the Board for approval in addition to the requirement for community outreach and a public hearing.

The **motion** was restated as follows: **motion** to support Staff's recommendation.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-4 (Ms. Burrows, Mr. Centamore, Mr. Lagi, and Ms. Reed dissenting).

Ms. Alarcon concluded that an update on mass transit within the CRA would be presented to the Board in December, if not earlier.

The Board revisited its earlier discussion of funding for firewall upgrades to cameras within the CRA, with Mr. Brown introducing the City's Chief Technology Officer, Mike Maier. Mr. Maier explained that the firewalls will improve security for video taken by the cameras, which goes directly to the Police Department. The cameras have been grouped into clusters, and all cameras within the CRA will use a single firewall. Should the CRA determine that they want a larger firewall, it would necessitate the purchase of a larger appliance.

Mr. Strawbridge asked if there are plans to place more cameras within the CRA. Mr. Maier replied that the Information Technology Services Department would be willing to place as many cameras within the CRA as the Board is willing to fund; however, the requested funding is not for cameras, but for the firewall. He added that each section of the City requires a different firewall for its cameras.

Chair Lucas suggested that the Board hear a comprehensive presentation on wifi at a future meeting in order to clarify issues regarding cameras and firewalls.

**VI. DDA Ambassador Program – Chris Wren, DDA**

This Item was not discussed.

**VII. CRA Visioning – Jonathan Brown, NPF CRA Manager**

Mr. Brown requested that the Board provide feedback before the next meeting with respect to the types of businesses they would like to see in the CRA and on the Sistrunk Corridor in particular, such as restaurants, specific types of retail, and other target industries they wish to incentivize. The Board can then discuss this vision for the CRA in the coming months. The intent is to market the CRA to the types of businesses the Board members would like to see there.

Ms. Burrows recalled that the CRA had hired a consultant to provide an overview of businesses currently located within the CRA. Mr. Brown advised that he would provide the Board members with copies of the consultant's report.

Chair Lucas suggested that the Board develop a subcommittee of its own to develop a retail strategy and report back to the full Board. Mr. Brown noted that the CRA plans to work with the City's Economic Development Department on an overall vision for the City, in which the CRA will play an integral part. He recalled that at an earlier meeting, the Board members were provided with a Housing and Economic Analysis prepared by Florida International University (FIU), which includes demographic and other public information. He offered to provide copies of this analysis once more via email.

**VIII. CRA Budget – Jonathan Brown, NPF CRA Manager**

Mr. Brown provided copies of the CRA budget, noting that the Board is not asked to make a recommendation on the document. He noted that more detailed information is provided in the current document, which will go before the CRA Board on September 7 and the City Commission on September 12, 2016.

Mr. Strawbridge observed that in the upcoming fiscal year, approximately \$4 million is budgeted for business incentives, including the streetscape grant program. In addition, funds are also budgeted for three different capital improvement programs that include



streetscapes. Mr. Brown explained that funds are set aside specifically for business and residential incentives; information on the City's website may be listed under former titles or old accounts that do not translate directly into individual projects. Once these have been reconciled, unprogrammed or unspent dollars will be moved into either business or residential incentives.

Mr. Strawbridge clarified that his question was related to why there are multiple allocations of funds for the same expenses. Mr. Brown reiterated that this is old account information, which includes line items for old accounts. When these funds are reallocated, they will be consolidated into either business or residential incentives.

Mr. Wilkes stated that if the Board is asked to review projects and approve funding requests, they should see a detailed budget that reflects the funds available in any individual account so they can make informed decisions.

Mr. Strawbridge noted that the target percentage of tax increment funding (TIF) revenue spent on public improvements in the CRA in 2017 is 15%, while in 2014 it was 16.6% and 20.8% in 2016. He did not feel this was a suitable goal for expenditures.

#### **IX. Communication to CRA Board**

None.

#### **X. Old / New Business**

Ms. Burrows recalled that The Mosaic Group is asked to present updates to the Board at every meeting, as recommended by the Mayor. Mr. Brown replied that the Mosaic Group may not always have items to report to the Board on a monthly basis.

#### **XI. Public Comment**

None.

#### **XII. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]